DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 090 987 IR 000 598

TITLE	Service or Organization; Two Views--Three Responses. University of Arizona Library Occasional Papers No. 1.
INSTITUTION	Arizona Univ., Tucson. Univ. Library.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	27p.; Papers presented at a Double-Session Colloquium under the Sponsorship of the Library and the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona (April 1973)
AVAILABLE FROM	Library Administrative Offices, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 85721 ($1.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Administration; Conferences; *Librarians; Libraries; *Library Services; *Philosophy; Speeches

ABSTRACT

The role of the library and librarians is discussed by five librarians in papers presented at a double session colloquium held in April 1973 under the sponsorship of the Library and the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona. Dr. Lawrence Clark Powell reminds librarians that the library is for the user and should be service oriented. He suggests that committee meetings and conferences be held after hours and on vacations so that the public would be able to have more contact with the best qualified people. Dr. H. William Axford also cautions against the overindulgence in committees and comments on Dr. Powell's dislike of scientific management. A panel response to these two papers was provided by Dr. Donald Dickinson, Ms. Ruth Risebrown, and Ms. Shirley Thurston. (JG)

ED 090987

SERVICE or ORGANIZATION

Two Views -- Three Responses

Papers presented at a double-session colloquium held in April, 1973, under the sponsorship of the Library and the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

University of Arizona Library
Occasional Papers Number 1
Tucson 1974

PREFACE

On April 4, 1973, Dr. Lawrence Clark Powell, Professor in Residence at the University of Arizona Graduate Library School, expounded on the subject of proprietary rights to libraries at the request of the University of Arizona Library and the Graduate Library School. The lecture was well attended by the Tucson and University library community. In his discussion of "Whose Library Is It?", Dr. Powell reiterated what some of his students, past and present, recognized as "Powellisms," or what Bill Axford later characterized as "the gospel according to St. Lawrence."

Members of the U. of A. Library Staff Association pondered his remarks and wondered if another point of view might not be appreciated by the audience which had responded so enthusiastically to Dr. Powell. With Dr. Powell's encouragement, a rebuttal session was planned and presented by the U. of A. Library Staff Association.

The key speaker at that session was Dr. H. William Axford, then University Librarian at Arizona State University in Tempe. Dr. Axford addressed himself to L.C.P.'s criticism of "scientific management" and discussed the service capabilities and responsibilities of today's libraries. He was followed by a panel of three speakers whose task was to respond to Dr. Powell or Dr. Axford or both. This was done admirably by, in order of appearance, Dr. Donald Dickinson, Director of the U. of A. Graduate Library School; Ms. Ruth Risebrow, Assistant Professor in the Library School and teacher of the course in Library Management; and Ms. Shirley Thurston, Chief Instructional Materials Librarian at the U. of A. Library.

Before beginning his talk on "Library Saints and Sinners," Dr. Axford took a moment to express his appreciation of the importance of this kind of forum within the local library world. He attributed much of the enthusiasm and the degree of success it enjoyed to the influence of the new Library School in Tucson. We would like to add that such exchanges are also due to the active interest of the U. of A. Library staff members. Without the participation of both planners and audience, the sharing of library philosophies would not be possible.

The University of Arizona Library Staff Association

Tucson
January, 1974

CONTENTS

A Cold Look at a Hot Subject or Whose Library Is It?	Lawrence Clark Powell	1
Library Saints and Sinners	H. William Axford	7
Response	Donald Dickinson	14
Response	Ruth Risebrow	16
Response	Shirley Thurston	20
The Contributors		23

A COLD LOOK at a HOT SUBJECT

or

WHOSE LIBRARY IS IT ?

by Lawrence Clark Powell

Once upon a time I was one of you -- a library school student and a library staff member. I was more militant then and complained about the dullness of the curriculum and of library routines. I displeased the head librarian by helping to organize a staff association. Even as a head librarian I was really still one of you, for it happened early before I grew more conservative.

Then after the passage of years, I became radical again, a drop-out. I retired as a librarian to become a full-time researcher, writer, and occasional teacher. Then I was no longer one of you. My attitude toward the library school curriculum changed when I had to plan and teach it, not take it. Teaching proved more pleasant than being taught.

My attitude toward the library and its staff also changed. I came to regard it as my library, not theirs. It is the librarians' library only to the extent that they make it serve me and my kind. If a library staff proves willing and able to aid me and my colleagues, then are they recognized as useful people regardless of their classification or status. Now I have only one criterion for evaluating librarians -- by their knowledge and learning, and by their ability to share it cordially, efficiently, and promptly. Where they went to school and their present title and rank are of less importance.

Since becoming a constant library user, here and elsewhere, I have observed that librarians have become increasingly addicted to committees and conferences. The higher the person's rank, the more apt he is to be elsewhere.

Better services to users would result if most committees met after library hours and conferences were held on vacation time. I do not include such meetings as the current series of colloquia on this university's resources sponsored by the Library Staff Association. I do not approve of staffing public desks with the least qualified personnel. Better to let patrons help themselves, cafeteria style, than to staff public desks with student help that is neither willing nor able.

When I recall some of the great reference librarians I have known -- Robert Haynes of Harvard, Constance Winchell of Columbia, and Robert Collison of London and now U.C.L.A. -- I see them there on the firing line, not in a back office.

I hear you ask, when did they get their administrative work done if much of the time they were on public duty? I'll tell you when: on their second forty-hour week. A library whose staff is concerned with the number of hours they work is a library without distinction.

Let me recall an instance of the danger of staffing a library on weekends and evenings with inexperienced personnel. The drama began with an order that a particular collection was to be restricted to use by a single person. Then one Saturday when the desk was staffed by a student, a patron requested access to this collection and was denied it.

The patron left without protest; then not long after, the roof began to shake and fell in with a crash. What happened? The patron had gone away quietly, true. Gone where? To the Regents. Who was that person? The donar of that particular collection.

I know that I will not gain many votes when I suggest that more of the staff's activities, particularly those that do not directly aid the public, be carried on after hours. I will be even more unpopular when I say that I do not believe in the current practice of continually involving staff in what is called the decision-making process. In a recent fiasco enacted on a local stage, I have heard this process given the odd name of Orbital Management. Whatever called, it seems to me a kind of library incest -- an activity that takes librarians from fertile intercourse with library users into sterile intercourse with each other.

If a library is fortunate in having a good administrator, the staff should thankfully let him and his deputies work themselves around the clock, while they go about their more important work of giving library service to those who need it. Library users are aware of administration only when it is bad. Good housekeeping is unseen and unheard. Only results interest library users.

What do I mean by a good administrator? I mean one who sees, knows, does, leads, one who can manage the machinery campus-wide. And one who perceives and recognizes those members of the staff who have administrative potential, and by this I do not mean verbal fluency -- those butterflies who flit about the library, propelled by their own enthusiasm for the irrelevant. Good administration requires strength, perception, and recognition in equal amounts. It also helps to soak regularly in a strong saline solution in order to toughen the hide. I once said that administration is better done than talked about, but now that I no longer do it, I feel free to talk.

I never believed in nor practiced what is called scientific management. There is only artful management, and the best treatise on it is over three hundred years old. I refer to the rules of human conduct formu-

lated by the Spanish Jesuit Balthasar Gracian y Morales. He also teaches the fine art of being administered.

So whose library is it? Mine, of course; mine, as user, along with the rest of the students, faculty, researchers, writers, and just plain readers. Library staff is present to serve others than themselves. If librarians prove able and willing to serve, they will inevitably gain status in the eyes of the patrons. They will be recognized as useful, needed, necessary, and as such they will be loved and rewarded and regarded as intellectual co-equals.

Such recognition cannot be self-bestowed nor gained by organized self-interest. It must come from outside the ranks of librarians and be gratefully given by those who are served. When that occurs, there is no gulf between users and librarians. Then whose library is it? Our library.

An incalculable number of working hours has been spent by librarians in search of faculty rank. I have always regarded this effort as mistaken and dangerous. There is only one way for librarians to achieve faculty rank, and that is by doing what the faculty does, that is, teach, research, write, and publish. And too close an identification with faculty can result in librarians suffering the miseries as well as the grandeurs.

Such misery was suffered a few years ago in California when, after long effort, the statewide university librarians were declared academic. Although this was not the equivalent of faculty rank, it resulted disastrously when Governor Reagan denied all academic salary increases. As a result, only the non-professional library staff, who had not been declared academic, received increases. Loud were the cries of the academic librarians when they felt the new shoes pinch.

Librarians are a unique class on campus and should have their own status, with their rights and privileges based on their responsibilities and achievements. I am glad that here on this campus those with interest and competence in research and scholarship qualify for sabbatical leaves with salary. We need more librarians with the motivation and competence of Donald Powell to pursue studies in areas of the university's strengths, studies which will make them and the library stronger and more useful.

Librarianship is peopled with persons who achieved status by their devotion to the service of others than themselves. It is with these persons that we should identify and model our careers. They are saints of library service. They are of all times and places and kinds of libraries, and are recognized as peers by grateful library users.

Thus far I've talked tough. Let me talk tender and thank the library staff for the help I've had in these three years that I have regarded it as our library. It would be a long roll call if I were to thank everyone who has helped me, in just about every branch and department into which my work has taken me.

In these fruitful years I have researched and written a book on Southwest literature now going off to the publisher. Most everything

needed was here, at least in printed materials. Manuscript sources also took me elsewhere, in addition to the good ones that are here, to research libraries in New Mexico, California, and Texas. Working always against deadline, I needed help and needed it fast. The best librarians were the ones who knew in depth and detail what their library held and how to produce it promptly.

There is no substitute for knowledge and there is no way to acquire it without constant study and learning. To study and learn, in or out of school, takes time. Where does one get time? By taking it from the non-essentials. And what are they? Sports, games and pastimes -- the L.C. HV's, if you please -- coming next to friends and family. They should be the last to go.

I have said that the printed sources are mostly here. One was lacking and not only from here, but also from libraries throughout the West, in spite of the fact that the UNION LIST OF SERIALS locates it in a dozen libraries. When I sought to find it, I learned that without exception, these libraries had discarded their files of this periodical which they had earlier stated they held.

I called Gordon Williams, Director of the Center for Research Libraries and my former assistant librarian. He located a file at the University of Illinois and a xerox was on the way to me within the hour.

What was this elusive periodical? It is called "Wings," the monthly publication of the Literary Guild. In its pages, and only there, appears biographical and critical information on the books and authors of Literary Guild choices. Without this unique source, I could not have learned what I did about the authors of Laughing Boy, The Journey of the Flame, and Coronado's Children.

I deplore this discarding of files which the UNION LIST indicates that a library possesses. Who's responsible? I suspect a staff committee, a task force, composed of persons without experience or judgement in research and writing. A committee, that is, a device for concealing individual responsibility.

Enthralling things occur as one follows Ariadne's thread. I needed to know the meaning of the place name with which John C. Van Dyke signed the preface of his masterpiece, The Desert, published by Scribner's in 1901. This was the first of a long line of books in praise of the Southwestern deserts, culminating in those by Joseph Wood Krutch.

The place name was La Noria Verde. The word noria was new to me. The dictionary revealed that it came into Spanish and English from Arabic. A noria is a wheel with buckets for raising water to irrigate arid lands.

In the 1890's Van Dyke's headquarters were in the Mojave Desert, on his brother Theodore's ranch at Daggett. I concluded that La Noria Verde was a well-station in that area. And so I wrote to E. I. Edwards, the bibliographer, who lives in Yucca Valley. Eddie did his best to locate

the place by map, by jeep, and by golly. No luck.

In the meantime I continued with my homework here on campus. The last of it was to read a roll of microfilm from Princeton University Library. Van Dyke was a New Jerseyite whose only publisher of forty books over a period of fifty years was Scribner's. I learned from Princeton's librarian, William S. Dix, that Scribner archives at Princeton contain 200 letters between Van Dyke and his two successive editors, W.C. Brownell and Maxwell Perkins.

At last I put the roll in the reader and began to crank and read and make notes and crank some more. Than I came to a letter and cranked no more until I had transcribed it in full. It was written in 1901 to Brownell from Del Rio, Texas, on the Mexican border; and it was accompanied by the newly completed manuscript of The Desert.

Although the book itself ended in Sonora, it appeared that Van Dyke had gone on to finish writing it in the neighboring state of Chihuahua, across the Rio Grande from the Texas town where he sent the manuscript off to New York. That would put La Noria Verde a far piece from Daggett, California.

I went to the map room here and with Mary Blakeley's help, we combed through maps of Chihuahua at the turn of the century. No luck. She then produced maps of the neighboring state of Sonora. More combing, with the aid of a magnifying glass. There Mary spotted it. La Noria Verde, a ranchería between Hermosillo and Nogales, a place of a few scattered ranches, watered probably to this day by a mule-drawn noria or bucketed waterwheel. It was there in February, 1901, that Van Dyke brought his book to an end and went on over the mountains to the first U.S. post office in Del Rio.

The establishment of our Graduate Library School means that Arizona library history and library biography will receive long overdue attention. A profession may be measured by the way it regards its past and its pioneers. For three years I have sought to persuade someone to undertake a biography of Estelle Lutrell, librarian of the University of Arizona from 1904 to 1932, and then Bibliographical Consultant until her death in 1950. Her achievement should be recognized beyond the placing of her name in bronze at the library's front door.

And now to end, is there anything to be learned from a meeting like this, from the old speaking to the young? Can experience be transmitted in words alone? I never learned anything from listening to my elders. Who they were and what they did was what instructed me. "What you are," said Emerson, "stands behind you and thunders so loudly, I cannot hear what you say."

Do then as I have done, and choose your own library saints, and shape your lives and careers on who they were and what they did, not on what they said. This means that you can do less reading, listening and talking, and instead be and do more to help those who use libraries.

Seek that secret way of lengthening the 24-hour day. And live by the Three H's of good librarianship -- by your hands, head, and heart. Remember this though -- library sainthood is conferred only posthumously.

LIBRARY SAINTS and SINNERS

by H. William Axford

In his talk before this group earlier in the month, Dr. Powell remarked that "library sainthood is granted only posthumously." Nevertheless, the text of his address encapsulates what believers and nonbelievers alike have come to know as the gospel according to St. Lawrence. By this I mean a doctrine preached with fervor pointing out the one and only road to salvation.

The message of the gospel is clear and simple, and therein lies its strength. The library belongs to the user, or, more correctly, that is to whom it ought to belong. There aren't many that actually do. In spite of the fact that we knowingly and unknowingly and more or less constantly sin against this fundamental truth, who among us can, or would want to, deny its validity?

In his address, Dr. Powell enumerated a number of practices, which because they violate the principle that the proprietary rights to the repositories of human knowledge are totally vested in the community of users, rank in the nature of cardinal sins. He then proceeded to identify some of those who by the magnitude of their transgressions have earned their way into his pantheon of sinners.

First and foremost is the librarian who has become "increasingly addicted to committees and conferences." Here, I must admit that I stand shoulder to shoulder with L.C.P., and I am sure he would applaud the words of Roy Pearson, who at the time he wrote them was Dean of the Andover Newton Theological School.

> "For one thing, it seems obvious to me that we have made a fetish of togetherness, elevated group dynamics to the status of a holy cult, and by insisting that every forward step be taken by a team, guaranteed that some of the most important steps will never be taken at all...
>
> "...groups are seldom authentically creative. Imagine a committee composing the 23rd Psalm, or painting the Mona Lisa, or conceiving a symphony like Beethoven's Fifth. Creating is done by individuals, not groups, and when the group usurps the individual's prerogative, the result is almost always stultification. Democracy is not a synonym for mediocrity, but it is a rare group which does not move toward a common denominator that lifts the level of the relatively incompetent only by

reducing that of the conspicuously able. Groups do not think; they merely accumulate thoughts; and since it is one of the main functions of the group to secure agreement, it is almost inevitable that the group will be destructive of the nonconformity out of which most new advances have emerged. It puts a fence around the dictator, but it also hamstrings the legitimate leader. It gives solace to the mediocrity which is always resentful of excellence, but it also emasculates the excellence which longs for freedom from bondage to the mediocre. And by condemning the leader always to operate in a group, we deny him the liberty to lead."

There is no doubt in my mind that the traditional hierarchial library organization has outlived its usefulness, but we ought to be aware of the dangers inherent in replacing Bureaucratus Rex with a coterie of committees. As Dr. Powell pointed out, an overindulgence in committees tends to turn the intellectual and physical energies of the library staff increasingly inward rather than toward the needs of the user community. Let me give you a concrete example.

Within the past few months, the University of Minnesota Library organized itself into a kind of mini-university. It established an elected senate, which, of course, immediately demonstrated the fecundity of a Tennessee brush rabbit with respect to setting up committees. A head of one of the branch libraries managed to get either elected or appointed to no less than nine of these committees and took the concomitant responsibilities so seriously that within a short time she was spending 90% of the normal work week in meetings. When reprimanded for dereliction of duty, she took umbrage and promptly filed a suit against the library administration charging discrimination. The Minnesota experience, I am sure, is not unusual, except for the lawsuit, and is an example of how infatuation for committee work can result in the side show taking over from the big events in the main tent.

There are times, of course, where committees can perform useful functions such as gathering and organizing information. The present trend, however, seems to favor ad hoc rather than permanent groups, a task force with one specific assignment which dissolves when its mission is accomplished. This approach makes it possible to utilize expertise much more effectively and avoids the ossification that overtakes permanent organizations. Actually, what we are searching for is an institutional structure flexible enough to allow the total leadership potential of a staff, irrespective of the organization chart, to make itself known and be put effectively to use. A hierarchy of committees cannot do this. The inevitable result is to replace a semi-benevolent despotism with a thinly veiled anarchy, both of which tend to feed on their own guts. What seems clear at the moment is that if participatory management is to achieve its promise, there must be more creativity with respect to implementation than has generally been demonstrated to date. What we don't need is more old wine in new bottles.

The second of Dr. Powell's library sinners is the public service

librarian who prefers being holed up in an office engaged in private projects and paper shuffling while the desk is being manned by unqualified people. Again, I can only throw my arms in the air and shout "Amen!" As a matter of fact, I do not even believe in having reference desks for the simple reason that once a librarian has planted himself in the chair, it becomes necessary to look busy. One just can't sit there doing nothing, resembling a beggar hoping that someone will stop and drop a coin in the cup. The librarian huddled over a stack of papers, or who has his nose in a book while working the reference desk, probably does more to discourage use of the library than anyone except the circulation clerk with the disposition of a pit viper with a migraine headache. How many times have you seen a user hesitatingly approach the reference desk and ask almost apologetically, "I hate to bother you but..."? Reference librarians need to be on their feet actively seeking out those who need help. Where will they find them? Mostly at the card catalog engaged in a kind of random access search for material on a project only partly defined or comprehended.

I also applaud Dr. Powell's dictum that housekeeping chores should be accomplished without expense to the user. However, I would prefer to delegate them to those individuals who are no longer needed at the reference desk when the reference librarians are on the firing line, rather than to resort to doing them after hours. As a matter of fact, a large percentage of the paper shuffling that goes on in a library really doesn't need to go on at all, and in the public service areas, most of it can be done by staff personnel. Nonprofessionals with the proper training are perfectly capable of handling scheduling, sickness, absence, and other statistical reports, in short, all of those things which delight the professional bureaucrat but which the service oriented librarian ought to avoid like the plague.

A third major figure in Dr. Powell's pantheon of sinners is the librarian addicted to scientific management. In some respects L.C.P. seems to view this type of person as the most potentially dangerous of the lot. Perhaps it is because he isn't as book oriented and tends to spend a good deal of time talking to machines and analyzing the data which they produce rather than talking to users of the library. More probably it is because of the scientific manager's impatience with the tenaciously held tribal orthodoxies which often serve as Holy Writ and pass for systems within the walls of academic libraries. Whose library is it? Well, all too often it seems to be the private preserve of the processing departments which needlessly gobble up 50% or more of the total manpower available to a given library.

It surely is obvious that I have reached the point where I must regretfully depart from the Gospel according to St. Lawrence, and run the risk of falling into a heresy so deep as to preclude any hope of salvation in this life or the next. In a way, this is sad, as I am not entirely sure that Dr. Powell is as adamant about administration being 100% art as he says he is, for it is well known that the inspired teacher often shows up wearing the robes of the Devil's disciple. However, having been a Powell watcher, as the current Washington jargon

would put it, for over a decade, I am inclined to take him at his word.

I think I can claim a commitment to the concept of scientific management. Others will have to judge the accomplishments. Perhaps at this point I should paraphrase T.H. Huxley and say that by scientific management I mean nothing more than the application of trained and organized common sense to the administration of libraries. It is true that in the course of this process, recourse will be had to management techniques borrowed from a different type of institution, but the overriding principle is that common sense must always stand in the way of a doctrinaire approach.

What lies behind this commitment to what Dr. Powell regards as alien ideology? The answers are simple. First of all, I have been disturbed for some time by what is just becoming recognized as a serious crisis of confidence with respect to the performance of university library directors. This situation is reflected in the very significant number of early retirements and other unusual means of attrition among libraries which are members of ARL. In a recent paper, Dr. Robert Downs and the late Dr. Arthur McAnally sought to bring to light those factors which have produced a 50% turnover in the directorships of ARL libraries within the past three years, four of them twice. They analyzed the external and internal pressures which in their opinion have in the course of a few years resulted in a high rate of attrition where stability has traditionally been the case.

Among the external pressures examined were the rapid growth which higher education underwent during the 1960's, a high rate of attrition among presidents, a proliferation of administrative offices tied to the president which has tended to downgrade the office of the library director, increasing control by state boards, greatly intensified demands from faculty and students for new services, and, of course, inflation combined with plateauing or decreasing budgets. They listed as internal pressures, demands from the staff for more participation in management, unionization, and a decline in the status of the director. The real importance of the article, however, lies in the way it reflects an attitude among library directors that is all too common, and which in my opinion is one of the most important causes of the crisis in confidence mentioned above. It is a naive belief that libraries are 100% efficient organizations. Listen to the words of Downs and McAnally. "When financial support is static, there is only one place to obtain the money for improved services other than book and journal funds." This administrative stance which is widely held in the profession, I must admit, is an anathema to me for it reflects a view of libraries which is similar to Pope's view of nature. "One truth stands clear, whatever is, is right."

It is interesting that in an era when the oldest and most tradition-oriented institution in the West, the Catholic Church, is undergoing fundamental changes related to adjusting to the changing needs of the society which sustains it, that many of the high priests of librarian-

ship still believe that there is a cosmic law which will protect libraries from a comparable evolution. Until this attitude is changed, we can only expect the crisis in confidence in library direction to deepen. And it is perhaps worth noting that at the present time the only effective internal pressure for change is from those iconoclasts and heretics who are groping for, pleading for, or demanding a more critical and scientific approach to library management.

The second reason for my commitment to scientific management lies in the budget crisis which higher education is presently undergoing. As budgets plateau, the only major source of manpower to mount new and innovative user-oriented programs is not the book budget as Downs and McAnally suggest, but a more efficient and effective utilization of the human resources already at hand. The possibilities here are substantial as the last three years at ASU have shown. Between 1969 - 70 and 1971 - 72, the number of man hours worked in the Technical Services Division dropped by 15%, or 27,516, which is the equivalent of 14.5 less employees. Productivity, on the other hand, as measured by the number of minutes required to acquire and fully process a volume rose by 34.5%. The key instrument in producing these labor savings was the unit cost study program which is reiterated each year. The object of this program is to determine the direct labor costs of acquiring and fully processing a volume or a title in terms of both dollars and minutes per function performed and by level of employee. Underlying the program is the assumption that the possibility exists that these costs can and must be reduced and that the savings thus achieved can be invested in upgrading old and developing new public service programs. Many libraries cost out their processing systems, but all too often the results are used as a club to further bloat the manpower budget rather than a reason for a critical look at existing systems to see how well they serve the user community.

The 14.5 positions reclaimed from the Technical Services Division at ASU were all invested in public service programs. Some of them have gone to augment the staff of the I.L.L. department and others to provide non-professional help in the reference department to take care of housekeeping chores. A large block has made possible the computer based indexes which were first made available to the public about three months ago. These include the Southwest Environmental Data Bank, the index to state documents, the index which is replacing the map catalog, the index to the Paolo Soleri archives, and the index to the literature spawned by scientific, technical and professional meetings -- all of those symposia, conferences, and the like which are lost in the card catalog under corporate headings.

A criticism often leveled at scientific managers is that they will always sacrifice quality to achieve quantity. When applied to those who resort to "speed" or main entry only cataloging rather than system revision, the charge is entirely true. It is obvious that you can't measure quality by quantitative methods, but it is possible to demonstrate that quantitative analysis properly applied can stimulate the

search for alternatives to traditional procedures -- a process which can produce major spinoffs for the user. For instance, increased productivity at ASU was not achieved by tampering with the bibliographic integrity of the catalog. As a matter of fact, increased productivity and more complete cataloging have gone hand in hand. As the unprocessed backlog of 60,000 to 70,000 volumes melted away, it became possible to provide as a routine matter analytics for all titles in series. This had been a hit-or-miss affair during the years when the catalog department was battling to handle an unprecedented work load with antiquated systems. In recent months, the author catalog has been completely read, hundreds of corrections have been made and hundreds of additional leader cards added. Subject entries for new serials are being prepared for the first time in a number of years and this project is being pushed retrospectively. Pockets of "difficult material" which had been gathering dust for months or even years have been cleaned up. Time has been found for thinking and planning for the future. Finally, the entire staff of the catalog department recently participated in a reorganization designed to make the best use of personnel at all levels. It is worth noting at this point that the bulk of these activities represent processing costs which were deferred from other years.

To date, almost 120 libraries, including two in Australia, have requested and have been sent the computer program and documentation, the manual and the ASU raw data on punched cards, a fact which seems to indicate a growing interest in a more scientific approach to library management. There are other significant straws in the wind. For instance, about two weeks ago,I learned that under the inspired trumpet calls of Richard Dougherty at Berkeley, the Walls of Jericho have begun to crumble. The staff has approved the switch to L.C., the insanity of maintaining a cumulative file of Title II depository cards will shortly come to an end, as will a system of revisors revising revisors, which absolutely boggles the mind in the magnitude of its wasted effort.

As a matter of fact, the processing systems at Berkeley are so convoluted that Dougherty feels that straightening them out will require a revolutionary approach. He has proposed to the Chancellor of the University that the Board of Regents grant him a loan to hire a group of team leaders who have no commitment to the present system. The loan, if granted, would be paid back in three to five years with salary savings produced by more efficient processing systems. The Chancellor is interested to the point that he is considering making the loan from funds available to his office.

It is ironical that people like Richard Dougherty are sometimes viewed as people with tunnel vision who see libraries only as complex machines to delight the tinker and mechanic. Such critics fail to see the forest for the trees. The main thrust of scientific library administration at this point in time is to develop techniques of resource allocation that maximize the benefits to the user rather than making the library staff comfortable and happy.

Thus, in the end, our deviation from the gospel as espoused by

Dr. Powell is not in the vision, but in the road we choose to salvation. We, too, believe that the library ought to belong to the user and are working behind the scenes to bring that belief closer to reality. Perhaps in the end this may be sufficient to allow us to atone for our sins in purgatory rather than being consigned forever to limbo. On the other hand, History has a way of canonizing heresy, and who knows, out of today's sinners may come some of tomorrow's saints.

RESPONSE

by Donald Dickinson

What we're talking about here today is the role, or the responsibility, or the function, of the librarian. I don't think we're talking about the school librarian, the public librarian, the academic or the special librarian, although I'm going to mention those in turn. I think what we're talking about is THE LIBRARIAN, capitals all the way. I'd like to start off with a quotation with which, I think, almost all of us could agree. It has been said by one of the leaders in the library profession, "It is the unique responsibility of the librarian to assemble, to organize, and to facilitate the use of graphic records." I think that there would be little disagreement with that. However, the quotation continues, and here you might choose to disagree, "The focal point of this activity is that moment when a book, a graphic record, passes into the hand of the reader. If this event takes place frequently and fruitfully, the library may be said to be successful. If it never takes place, nothing the library could be or do would justify its existence." Now I'll stand on that too. Dr. Jesse Houk Shera said it, and he may be an unexpected source for the quotation. I underline "to facilitate the use." What we're doing is assembling, organizing and facilitating the use of sources. Now, how do we do this? There are some obvious ways: the intelligent, quick reference librarian; the courteous circulation librarian. In addition, I think good management policy facilitates the use of the record, and this includes the involvement of staff at all ranks. A computerized circulation system, standing order plans, compilation of union lists, bibliographies, and many, many other things also facilitate the use of the collection. They don't all have to occur in public service, but the whole library is engaged in facilitating the use of the record.

All right, where do we find examples of this user-oriented service? Here I'd like to borrow a framework from an article that Samuel Rothstein once wrote about reference service in which he characterized reference service in three distinct groups: (1) maximum (2) middlin and (3) minimum. I think you've probably all been exposed to these different kinds of reference service. I have learned many things about school libraries from my colleagues, Mrs. Renthal, Mr. Van De Voorde, Mrs. Saltus; things that I didn't know before. Some of the best reference work, indeed maximum reference service, is often carried on by school librarians. They will do what's necessary

with the students in school. That's their first responsibility. Record keeping, even work with faculty and administration, stand in second place. The school librarian relates to the kids in the school, and that's maximum service. The other obvious example of maximum service operates in special libraries. Those of you who are taking Mrs. Perry's class this semester and have observed some special libraries in operation may know how this works. Some of the students went up to the Honeywell Library recently and were quite impressed with the operation that they saw there. The librarian in this case related directly to his public, the specialized public in that library, whoever it was, and he knew he was there for service. I apply the "maximum service" category to school libraries and special libraries--when it's done well, that's what's delivered.

The "middlin" category I'll apply to public libraries. I think the purpose of the public library is service to the entire community. Public librarians, the good ones, have always had this in mind. I think the public library is stretching out more and more, and again I listen to my colleague, Mr. Munn, to find out what public libraries should be. The role of the public library is service, and it has been done well in many cases.

Now we come down to the minimum category. I guess you know where that leaves us. This is my own field and I feel free to talk about it -- it's the academic library. A level of minimum service has unfortunately been the case too often in academic libraries. The old cast system prevails, I'm afraid, where the full-professor and dean get the red carpet treatment; the associate, the assistant. the graduate student go right down the scale to the undergraduate, even down to the library science student right at the bottom. There are conflicts in the academic field which have never been resolved. Examples are conflict with housekeeping chores, which already has been mentioned, and the conflict with "preserving the record." Of course this needs to be done, but does it need to be done ahead of service? Unfortunately, every academic library is trying to be the Yale of the West - the Yale of the Southwest - the Yale of the Central Southwest. I think it's weakening. Let me give you a catalog of some of the deadly sins. These are not necessarily sins of academic libraries, but since that's been my field, the one I know the best, perhaps they will reflect that point of view. Some of them are in the forms of quotations. "It's in the bindery." "Have you looked in the catalog?" "We don't buy fiction." How can we tolerate a lack of interlibrary loan services to undergraduates? I know all the reasons for it, but why do we do it? I'm thinking about libraries that I've worked in. We see three weeks loan for undergraduates, a year loan for faculty, or forever. A library may have no good system for instruction in use of the library for undergraduates. This is something that we've needed to do for years and years. A lot of questions need to be answered. Much that's done in libraries is good; much is service-oriented; and much needs change. I would suggest to you that one of our purposes in the library school is to try to be open for change. Practicing librarians ought to be open for change and that change ought to set service as the predominant goal.

RESPONSE

by Ruth Risebrow

I would like to say how pleased I am that Dr. Axford was able to talk to us today. In my opinion he combines in excellent proportions two essential characteristics of a library director. He is a fine librarian and a good manager.

As a life-long proponent of good management and a teacher of scientific management, I am going to use my allotted time partly to disagree with some of Dr. Powell's statements but also to develop some ideas of my own.

I have my orthodox moments. I agree with Dr. Powell that a library is a service organization. Few of us here today would argue with that. But libraries serve many different publics and need to serve them in so many ways. The public most familiar to me, scientists, is much more concerned with what is being published tomorrow than what was published yesterday. Their needs have to be met in entirely different ways to those with Dr. Powell's interests or our many other publics. We have to find ways of serving all these publics and we must do it while contending with expanding materials and contracting resources. Even when money was easier to come by, many library directors were already concerned with that term "justification" -- "justification of a budget" -- "justification of a program." Many people in Washington, in state capitols, and in city governments are also concerned with the need to justify expenditures.

We must develop and extend our resources, both materials and people, and learn to allocate them wisely. That is management, or if you prefer a more highfaluting term, administration. There are various tools which we may use if we will learn to use them. Some of us have been using them all along. Good service needs a good collection and good organization behind it. The service-oriented librarians that Dr. Powell quite rightly admires are not the only past librarians that we can be proud of. Collection building was my first library job, and in several of the large libraries where I worked I was often delighted and amazed at how well earlier librarians had spent their resources to develop collections to serve the future as well as the present. One of the great mathematical models was devised by a librarian -- the Dewey Decimal System. Many excellent studies in the past were done by scholarly librarians using scientific management techniques. But we need to know so much more about our business

and our profession. We need time and we need people for research and development.

We can calculate the cost of storing materials as opposed to joining a network and borrowing them, but what is the cost of delay to the user? How do we cost or weight that? We know what the cost is of keeping a library open twenty-four hours a day, or twelve hours a day. What is the cost of closing it the other twelve hours? Is the cost the same for a future Einstein as it is for an ordinary graduate student or undergraduate or a faculty member? How do we evaluate our service?

Yes, our patrons appreciate it when we give them service. It is the service you get that you appreciate, not the service you miss. But if one of the reference librarians spends three hours tracking an obscure reference for a faculty member while two or three undergraduates wander disconsolately around looking for help, what is the cost? Is it a plus or is it a minus? How do we cost it? How do we report our services? Again it is true that it is the public who appreciates us or otherwise, but it's the board that gives us our money. And often boards are more interested in statistics of quantity, not quality. So we have to find ways of quantifying our quality. And it is possible if we work together... both scholars and scientific management.

Dr. Powell suggested that ordinary librarians leave management to work at the top. We cannot separate management like cream and milk into two neat levels. Management occurs at all levels. Decisions are made at all levels. In your daily job, in your private life, you make decisions constantly. You manage your own resources. And when you do this on the job you are managing the university resources or the public library resources or those of the state, and those decisions affect management decisions. Management is often pictured as a triangle, with the director up here and the peasants down here. And the decision is made at the top and broken into smaller and smaller specific segments so that it finally gets down to the person who pastes the labels in the books or marks the spines. But management, like communication, is a two-way street. It goes up and down. No decision should be made at the top without full knowledge of the decisions and methods being used at all levels. Decisions at the bottom will affect decisions at the top. What is more to the point, decisions made at the top will not be carried out effectively at the bottom if the people at the bottom do not agree and see the sense in those decisions. So it is a two-way street.

Again, how do you recognize management potential in librarians if they are not participating in management at their own level? How do you develop managers? Good ones don't appear as a miracle or a gift of God. They are developed.

I agree, there is art in management. But the artful manager will also use science. The artful manager will also develop the potential of all his people as he goes along. It is true that some of this is time-consuming. It is true that we often spend far too much time in

meetings. I used to say that meetings were where a bunch of people gathered together in order to say that nothing could be done. However, a well-structured meeting can be productive. We need more on-the-job training. We hope that our librarians do learn something about being a librarian in school, but a lot of it is on-the-job. Some of it you learn the hard way -- experience. Some you learn in informal contacts, informal communication with other people at work. But sometimes you do need the formal meeting or the formal seminar. However, too often we are called to meetings in which we are supposed to have a free exchange of information but some of us like dinner guests at the Borgias do not feel free to partake. If a meeting is to be successful, then everyone there should be contributing and partaking; otherwise the meeting is a waste of time, or at least for some of the people there it is a waste of time.

Now, librarians are not only managing for the day, we are managing for the future. I'm very aware as a teacher that the students that I am working with today will be still active practicing managing librarians in the next century, although some of us may not be around or we may not be active. So we have always to keep in mind the future as well as the present. And the future, particularly when you're looking at it as a science librarian, is rather frightening. It was estimated in 1969 by the National Academy of Sciences that a person reading at 200-300 words per minute would take fifty years to read a single year's scientific publishing. Now, one need not read it at all, it's true, but how does one separate the wheat from the chaff? We complain about junk that should have never been published. How do you know that junk is junk if you don't at least skim it? We need to use all the new techniques of automation, microforms, networks, etc. that we can possibly lay our hands on to help us cope with control and to facilitate access to these materials. Every librarian will have to be knowledgeable about these things, not just the top management. And scientific management is merely the application of certain kinds of techniques to problems in many fields.

Again, management is a practical science. One cannot separate management from what is managed. So, in my opinion, librarians and only librarians should manage libraries. However, we must insure that they are knowledgeable about the techniques needed to manage their resources and manage their organizations. And that is all scientific management is. It is a group of techniques which allow a person in any field to quantify certain measures. It eliminates some of the uncertainty in some of the factors in any given situation. It enables the manager to make, we hope, a better decision. It allows him to choose alternate paths wisely. It is not a substitute for wisdom or experience. It is merely some additional information. Now why would anyone not want to use any additional information he can? So again that is where I stand -- firmly with the scientific management. Firmly with the people who believe that the managers should be librarians. Certainly they should be able if they wish to go outside the profession and get advice, but they ought to be able to evaluate the

advice they are getting. There has been too much poor advice from too many consulting firms because librarians simply did not know the language. We must be able to speak the language even if we do not know the techniques.

Finally, I think that what constitutes good service is often in the eye of the beholder. A few years ago when I was travelling in Europe I was talking to a friend of mine about some countries we had visited, and he said that he much preferred France to England. And as he had just been complaining bitterly about the fact that most French innkeepers were thieves and that all Paris taximen were highwaymen, I was a little bit surprised, and I asked, "How come you prefer France to England where you say they all are so honest?" And he said, "Well, yes, the English are honest, but they are so dour about it. The French steal you blind, but with such charm!" In my opinion, if we don't fully utilize all the techniques available to us, we had better develop quite a lot of charm, because we will be short-changing ourselves and we will be stealing the public blind.

RESPONSE

by Shirley Thurston

To respond to Dr. Powell's speech is to respond to a tradition of librarianship that is well established, but I had such a gut reaction to some of the implications of his words I was grateful when asked to speak. Some of my reaction reveals my belief that users have changed and library services can change. Another part of my reaction will defend activity going on in the University of Arizona Library System.

Let me say that librarians who keep storehouses will always treasure a user like Dr. Powell. He knows how the library is organized and maintained. He patiently accepts its ways and willingly plods through mountains of bibliographies, references, and footnotes to get to the manuscript containing an answer to his question. He has faith and confidence that his laborious cranking of the microfilm reader will yield results. He is sure the library has the answers and the librarian basks in his faith. He will search for them and in his prefaces to new books thank the librarians for thinking of storing his answer before he asked the question.

If library users today would act and think like Dr. Powell, then libraries and librarians could go on maintaining storehouses, waiting for users, and continuing to assume that the library is an institution all intelligent people can use easily.

As I listened to Dr. Powell, I recalled a Latin American historian telling the class of his great pleasure in using a very old and dusty library in Spain. He read a poem about that library which brought to life the ghosts of the characters who composed the books and flitted through the pages. Hearing that poem I imagined as did the historian the characters stepping from pages and parading up and down the aisles of the medieval library that had imprisoned them forever. That library was a storehouse and its users were working like Dr. Powell, patiently and independently with their books and notes.

I also thought of my library experience at Columbia University before I became a librarian. I had trouble with a footnote. Thinking librarians were knowledgeable, I approached the reference desk to ask for assistance. The response of the reference librarian led me to believe that I was too stupid for Columbia and should leave immediately. So I learned to work like Dr. Powell. I went from the catalog to the shelf, back and forth. To do my work, I never asked for assistance again.

Once I studied in a library without a librarian. There I found all kinds of useful materials, for the library was small and open. By mysterious means materials were made available.

But I maintain that users have changed and that libraries need to adjust. Librarians need to realize that there are numerous potential users who need information but who cannot afford to work like Dr. Powell, and who do not have the library understanding which he does. Their main jobs are not working in libraries to turn out books. They have other jobs for which information is needed, but they don't have the time to go to the library, the time to listen to directions about library organization and bibliographical control. They can't travel to far places for information. Users want librarians who can give them answers quickly. Maybe I should say, users need librarians who will answer questions, not just store answers. A university administrator can't be sure that he can pick up the phone and get an answer to a problem he is working on because he doesn't know if the librarian is willing to help him. So he doesn't call. But in a business any worker can ask and expect rapid service from the library by the best, most thorough means available. In a special library with limited materials the man who wanted information about plaster was ordered a search by an institute in another state. Actual information was given rather than the direction on ways to locate information. As Mary Blakeley looked for information for Dr. Powell, so many more librarians are giving such service. Professors groan about going to the library for their own work. They give students fewer assignments requiring work in libraries because they agree with the students that the amount of material in the library and its organization may be too difficult to justify the time. This problem is particularly serious at a large university.

I would suggest that faculty be encouraged to use the phone to start searches by librarians. Face-to-face confrontations between librarian and user are not always necessary for assistance. Eventually faculty will have terminals in their offices to find out without a walk the content of the library. Already on-line bibliographic searches are available for those who can buy.

Dr. Powell found little reason for librarians to meet and talk so frequently in committees. He felt housekeeping of the library could be done after hours, so that service to patrons would be fully available during the day. Here, after a long time of limited participation, many librarians meeting in committees are contributing information to solve identified problems in the library. Without them the problems would remain. Maybe the role of information in people's lives and the increase in information have caused librarians to forget their purposes, and they must stop to reformulate the direction of their future services. If libraries must be more than storehouses, then they must be something more than housekeeping operations. They might become information centers with librarians informing potential users by current awareness services and interest profiles of available information that's relevant to their needs. Technology has arrived

to reduce some of the housekeeping problems. Time must be taken to decide how the housekeeping will be done in the future so that services can be improved. Housekeeping is a problem. The Association of Research Libraries felt compelled to create an Office of Management Studies to learn about and solve the problems libraries are having in organization, activity, and administration.

I believe Dr. Powell is only one kind of library user. I don't believe "our library" is the one only owned by storehouse librarians and users like Dr. Powell. The library belongs to a large community composed of different kinds of users. Libraries will meet demands if they acknowledge the changing needs of users. If they don't, the users will push for change in personnel and organization. Libraries don't belong to librarians. As long as the user's needs are met, the librarians belong in the library.

THE CONTRIBUTORS

H William Axford

Presently, Dr. Axford is University Librarian at the University of Oregon. At the time of this presentation, he held the same position at Arizona State University. Dr. Axford received his library degree as well as a Ph.D. in history from the University of Denver.

Donald Dickinson

Dr. Dickinson is Director of the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona. Prior to this appointment, he was Director of Reader Services at the University of Missouri Library. He has also served as a professional librarian in several other schools in the Midwest. Dr. Dickinson received his Ph.D. in Library Science from the University of Michigan.

Lawrence Clark Powell

Presently serving as Professor in Residence at the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona, Dr. Powell is well-known for his bibliographies and essays and for his long and distinguished career at UCLA. There he served as University Librarian, Director of the W. A. Clark Memorial Library and founding Dean of the School of Library Service. Dr. Powell earned his Ph.D. at the University of Dijon.

Ruth Risebrow

Ms. Risebrow is presently Assistant Professor of Library Science in the Graduate Library School of the University of Arizona. Prior to joining the faculty of the Library School in 1972, Ms. Risebrow was an HEW fellow in the Library Systems Management Program in the Department of Industrial Engineering at the University of Oklahoma.

Shirley Thurston

Presently Chief Instructional Materials Librarian for the University of Arizona, Ms. Thurston was previously Head Librarian, Information Research Department, Franklin Mint and prior to that, Director of Learning Resources Center, Community College, Delaware County. Ms. Thurston earned a master's degree from the Teacher's College of Columbia University and her library degree from Drexel University.